Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed August 19, 2003. In this Office Action, Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-11, 27, 29-36, 39-45, 48 and 51-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Wakefield, II (U.S. Pat. No. 5,961,561); Claims 4, 14-18, 21-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wakefield, II in view of Durston et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,707,848); Claims 5, 7, 37-38, 47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wakefield, II in view of Ziegra et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,183); Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wakefield, II in view Durston et al and further in view of Ziegra et al.; and Claims 12, 13, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wakefield, II in view Rutkowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,826,270).

As a result of this Amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 10-18, 22, 23, 26, 43, 45-48, and 52-55 have been amended and are believed to be allowable over the art of record. Further, claims 56-79 have been added and also are believed to be allowable over the art of record. Claims 27-42 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-26 and 43-79 are now pending.

As a preliminary matter, the cancellation of claims 27-42 and the amendments to claims 1, 3-6, 10-18, 22, 23, 26, 43, 45-48, and 52-55 should not be deemed an acquiescence of the prior art teachings or disclosure of Moore, Moore et al. or Wakefield, II, as asserted in both the Final and the first, non-final Office Action. Rather, these amendments and cancellations have been made in furtherance of expediting the prosecution of the present application. Indeed, Applicant reserves the right to re-submit the cancelled and pre-amended claims in a continuing application. With that said, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and in consideration of the following remarks.

A. 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 Rejections

1. Claims 1-13 and 43-55:

In the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 43 were rejected as anticipated by Wakefield, II. In general, claims 1 and 43 are directed to a computer-implemented method for providing advisory information to field service providers communicating with a server computer by way of network devices. The advisory information relates to some aspect of a utility device maintained at a destination facility by the field service providers. For example, the advisory

information may include an indication of how operating parameters of a specific utility device relate to a set of threshold operating conditions.

Both claims 1 and 43 are hereby amended to recite selection from a storage module of specific advisory information for transmission to a specific field service provider. The specific advisory information is selected based on a provider identification code associated with the field service provider. None of the prior art of record teach or suggest selection of specific advisory information based on a provider identification code, as recited in amended claims 1 and 43. As such, these claims are believed allowable over the art of record, and prompt passage to allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and claims 44-55 depend from claim 43. Therefore, claims 2-13 and 44-55 are believed allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 43, respectively are believed allowable over the art of record.

2. Claims 27-42:

Although Applicant specifically traverses the Examiner's rejections to claims 27-42, See Amendment filed on June 30, 2003 in Reply to the Office Action mailed on March 30, 2003, these claims are hereby cancelled without prejudice. As such, Applicant reserves the right to re-submit these claims at a later time.

3. Claims 14-26:

In general, claim 14 is directed to a network advisory system for providing advisory information to field service providers. Claim 14 is hereby amended to recite selection from a storage module of specific advisory information based on a provider identification code associated with the field service provider requesting access to the network advisory system. As such, amended claim 14 recites at least one limitation that is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record, and therefore is allowable over same. Claims 15-26 depend from claim 14 and hence recite an invention that incorporates the same limitations of claim 14. Therefore, claims 15-26 are believed allowable for at least the reasons that claim 14 is believed allowable over the art of record.

B. New Claims 56-79

Claims 56-79 are hereby added in this application. Claims 56-69 are directed to a network advisory system for providing advisory information to field service providers. The network advisory system includes a communication interface that selects specific advisory information for transmission to a field service provider based on the provider identification code associated with that field service provider. As such, claims 56-59 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as noted above in connection with independent claims 1, 14 and 43.

Claims 70-79 are generally directed to managing maintenance of a wash machine from a remote facility, and therefore recite a specific embodiment of the present invention pertaining to wash machines. No new matter has been added in these claims, which also are believed allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

This Amendment is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Final Office Action mailed August 19, 2003. Still, the Final Office Action may contain other arguments that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding amendments and arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Final Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument to have merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

With the submission of this Amendment and the accompanying RCE, claims 1-26 and 43-79 are pending in the application and are believed to be clearly allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, prompt allowance and passage of the application to issue are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, he/she is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns. A check is submitted herewith to cover the addition of claims 56-79 as well as the above-noted extension of time fee. Please charge any additional fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2003

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

David D. Wier, Attorney Reg. No. 48,229
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(303) 357-1647